Charles C. Cox
3118 W. Vliet Street
Milwaukee, Wisc. 53208

Mr. Editor,

PLEASE print this letter in the Milwaukee Journal

I am the father of CHARLES LAYTON COX and I am writing this letter to state my amazement and bewilderment over the conviction of my son. He is INNOCENT.

My son asked me to go with him the day he went to the Burlington area to look for gravel and because of my refusal to go my son will be put in a federal penitentiary for the rest of his life.

If I had the money I would hire lawyers and investigators who could prove to the Court that my son is innocent and that he is the victim of circumstances. But I don't have the money. And it is only because of my lack of money that my son was found guilty in the first place.

My sons COURT APPOINTED attorney is a good man — but he was bucking the U.S. Government and it is impossible for one person to do this.

The policeoffice who identified my son as being one of the robbers is a brave man, but he is mistaken.

This policeofficer testified that the robbers getaway car approached him as he was blocking a small bridge with his patrolcar. He saw the robbers coming right at him because he was standing outside of his car. The robbers passed him at a distance of approximately 10 feet but yet he was unable to identify them by features or by clothes even though he had his glasses on, she was calm, and he had unobstructed view of the car and the men in it.

(The getaway car had to be going slow because immediately after passing him they made a left turn off of the bridge.)

Then after approaching the policeofficer

one of the robber shot at him, he lost his glasses, he got into his patrolcar and he chased the robbers until such time as he came over a hill and saw that the getaway car was crashed into a pole and that the two men were fleeing.

He said that one man was running NORTH and that the other man was running EAST.

He further stated that while making a decision as to which man he should chase, the man running EAST looked back over his shoulder.

This policeofficer now states that he observed my son at a distance of approximately 50 feet away, while in his patrolcar, looking through the closed passenger window, and his glasses are off!

(Is it not logical that the officer would be excited after being shot in the head?)

I still say this officer is a brave man but he is only human too and there is more then reasonable doubt as to what he saw.

He further said that my son was wearing a red jacket and dark shoes, but just moments later my son was searched and released by a policeofficer who testified that my son was wearing white shoes and a dark jacket!

It is awful easy to say that my son could have changed from one outfit to another but how can you reconcile this to the fact that the entire area was searched by hundreds of law enforcement officers, dogs, and airplanes?

My son testified to the fact of being in the immediate vicinity of the car crash and the spot where the one Robber was killed. This was corroborated by witnesses for both sides.

Is it not conceivable that the police-officer could have seen my son there at that time, and then when he was shown my sons

pictures the next morning it would only be natural that he would remember seeing my son before and that his picture would seem positively familiar?

The officer only looked at the robber who got away for just a moment and I would sure hate to be locked up on those basis alone for the next 45 years.

There were bank employees who stated on the stand that the robber wore blue pants. The prosecution was holding up a pair of my sons work trousers which had HUGE iron on patches on the knees. Nobody at no time mentioned that the robber who got away was wearing anything other than blue pants.

The patches on my sons pants were right on the knee, they were almost white in color, they covered at least a six inch area. By god, a half blind person would have been able to see them. But none of the dozen or so people in the bank saw anything other than blue or dark pants!

One of the prosecution witnesses testified that immediately after hearing the exchange of shots between the police officer and the slain robber he had occasion to observe my son for almost the next four hours. He said that my son was wearing brown pants. For heaven sakes, brown is brown and blue is blue. This witness even told the prosecution that the pants introduced as evidence against my son were positively not the ones my boy was wearing that day!

The prosecution had bank employees testify that a pair of tennis shoes introduced into evidence against my son were the ones the robber wore. My son tried those same shoes on in full view of open court and he had all he could do to put his toes into them!

The prosecution put a witness on the stand who was brought from prison to testify against

my son. This witness testified that my son had showed him some maps in December of 1966 and offered him $500.00 to drive the getaway car after the bank robbery. This man also testified that the dead robber and my son were close friends in the Terre Haute Federal Penitentiary. He testified that my son and the dead robber ate together all the time and walked the prison yard together while they were in the Terre Haute Federal Penitentiary.

After the government rested their case my son proved that the dead man was never in the Terre Haute Federal Penitentiary in his life.

The government again called back this witness and showed him two BLACK masks, and asked him if he had ever seen them before. This witness said that my son had showed them to him in December of 1966! (The masks the robbers used in the bank robbery were of a clear plastic material), but yet this witness was able to say he had seen the masks before. When my sons attorney asked this witness what color were the masks when he first saw them he said RED!

This government witness was called from a penitentiary to testify against my son. The testimony he gave on the stand is contradictory to two signed statements he made to Secret Agents of the F.B.I. on two different occasions.

In December of 1967 while in custody this witness signed a statement saying:

1. My son offered him $4,000.00 to drive from the bank to the Illinois State Line (approx. 20 miles!)

2. He and my son were in a bar between 19th & 20th street on VLIET.

3. He (the witness) knew Putnum from Terre Haute Federal Penitentiary.

4. Putnum offered him $6000.00 to drive the car

5. The relationship between my son and the dead robber was close while they were in the Terre Haute Federal Penitentiary.
   (a) They seldom went into the prison yard.
   (b) They usually went to prison library together.

In March of 1968 while still in custody this witness signed a statement saying that it was to confirm his previous statement:

1. Putnum offered him $3000.00 to drive the car.

2. He and my son were in a bar between 23rd & 24th street on VLIET.

3. He (the witness) knew Putnum from Wisconsin State Penitentiary.

On the stand this witness testified that my son offered him $500.00 to drive the getaway car; that they were in a bar on 16th and WELLS street.

In a 90 day period this witness told three different stories so full of contradictions that even a child could see through them.

When called to the stand again this witness identified a gun as one he saw in my sons car in December of 1966.

Is it not strange that in neither of the two signed statements given to the FBI did he mention anything about guns, or masks?

This man was brought into the courtroom from a sideroom when called to testify against my son. On a table in front of him were all the

evidence produced in the case.

At his first appearance on the stand he claims to identify a map as one seen in 1966; On his second appearance he identified two BLACK masks as the ones he saw in 1966; On his third appearance he identified a gun as one he saw in 1966.

In my opinion, had this man testified any further, there is no telling what he might have said!

Also, this witness made a statement that my son threatened him during the trial. But yet two U.S. Marshals took the stand and testified that my son had not said one word to this witness.

In addition, my sons attorney stated in open court that he was with my son when this alleged threat took place but the prosecution said that counsel cannot testify for the defense.

There was a man who testified on the stand that he robbed the SILVER LAKE, Wisconsin BANK and that in the getaway he shot the officer.

To refute this mans testimony the prosecution introduced into evidence three records which purport to prove that this man was working on the day of the robbery:

(a) A Time Card
(b) A Daily Production Sheet
(c) A Monthly Payroll Sheet

The time card had no company name on it. All the days of the week prior to the bank robbery were MACHINE PUNCHED — but the day of the bank robbery was not. This date was wrote in by hand!

The daily production sheets introduced as evidence consisted of numerious sheets of paper with different workers names on the top of each sheet showing the date and the amount

of production for that date. Some of the prayers were dated for the 15th of November, others were dated the 16th of Nanember, and several more were dated the 17th of Nanember. But the production sheet for the man who said he robbed the bank didnt have any date on it whatsoever!

And finally, the monthly payroll sheet consisted of a list of names showing the hours worked during the month by day. There was a name crossed out in the middle of the sheet and the mans name who claimed to have robbed the bank was wrote in the crossed out spot!

And more, there are two people who made statements to the FBI and this has not been brought to light.

A woman made a statement to the FBI that she had seen the getaway car earlier on the morning of the bank robbery and that she had observed two men. She looked at the body of the dead man as he was laying on the ground where he was shot and said that he was similar to the two men she saw earlier. She was shown photographs of my son and other white males but could not identify any of them as persons she had seen before.

A man made a statement to the FBI that he was standing near the bridge where the two robbers shot at the policeoffier. He said he believed he would know them if he seen them again. This man was shown a photograph of my son with three other pictures of other people and he did not make any identification!

My son requested the court, through his attorney to subpoene these two witnesses. The court DENIED the motion!

I am not an attorney but in light of everything that took place during the trial I dont see how my son could be found guilty.

If their is anybody who reads this letter who can help my boy I beg you to please do so. My boy is innocent and I feel just terrible that he has to suffer behind prison bars all because I don't know how or what to do to help him.

If anyone can helps in anyway I would be most grateful to hear from them.

My address is:

CHARLES C. COX
3118 W. Vliet St.
Milwaukee, Wisc. 53208

My phone number is:
933-7321

Respectfully yours,
Charles C. Cox

April 1, 1968

DEAR MOM & DAD

Please show this letters to attorneys and anybody else who is interest in justica.

I am innocent and these fact that are wrote here are all the truth — so you see, I am being put into prison for something I didit do.

There has to be justice somewhere and I beg you to help me find it.

LOVE,

Charles